

vice chairman are unable to certify it poses no threat to the national security. Finally, the 45-day review is required if the Director of National Intelligence (DNI) identifies intelligence concerns with the transaction that he concludes could threaten national security, and these threats have not been mitigated during the 30-day review. The bill also contains numerous other provisions to strengthen the CFIUS review process.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 556 for four important reasons. First, it subjects transactions involving foreign governments to a stricter level of scrutiny. Second, the bill provides for senior-level accountability for CFIUS decisions. Third, the bill improves CFIUS accountability to Congress. Finally, H.R. 556 strengthens the CFIUS review process by establishing a formal role for intelligence assessments for every transaction. I will briefly discuss each of these important procedural improvements.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, the Dubai Ports World deal was approved by mid-level officials and without a 45-day national security investigation of the transaction, even though Dubai Ports World was owned by a foreign government. H.R. 556 strengthens current law by requiring in cases involving a company that is controlled by a foreign government, a non-delegable certification by either (1) the chairman of CFIUS (the Secretary of the Treasury) or the vice-chairman of CFIUS (the Secretary of Homeland Security) that the transaction poses no national security threat. In the absence of this non-delegable certification, a second-stage 45-day national security investigation of the transaction must take place.

Next, H.R. 556 ensures senior level accountability for CFIUS decisions by requiring the chairman and vice chairman of CFIUS to approve all transactions where CFIUS consideration is completed within the 30-day review period (limiting delegation of approval authority to the Under Secretary level); and requires that the President approve all transactions that have also been subjected to the second-stage 45-day national security investigation.

H.R. 556 improves CFIUS accountability to Congress. As was noted above, Members of Congress were not notified of the CFIUS approval of the Dubai Ports World deal. This bill rectifies this failure by requiring CFIUS to report to the congressional committees of jurisdiction within 5 days after the final action on a CFIUS investigation, and permits the committees to request one detailed classified briefing on the transaction. The bill also requires CFIUS to file semi-annual reports to Congress that contain information on transactions handled by the committee during the previous 6 months.

Last, H.R. 556 strengthens the CFIUS review process by establishing a formal role for intelligence assessments for every transaction. The bill requires that every transaction be subjected to an assessment by the Director of National Intelligence (DNI) and contains provisions to ensure that the DNI has adequate time to conduct the required assessment.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 556 represents an important contribution to our effort to secure the homeland. Last November, the American people voted for change, they voted for competence, they voted for a new direction for our country. I am proud to say that with H.R. 556, the new majority has once again delivered on its promise to chart a new direction to make America safer and more secure.

I urge all Members to join me in supporting H.R. 556.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 556.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1600

COURT SECURITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2007

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 660) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect judges, prosecutors, witnesses, victims, and their family members, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 660

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Court Security Improvement Act of 2007".

TITLE I—JUDICIAL SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS AND FUNDING

SEC. 101. JUDICIAL BRANCH SECURITY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) ENSURING CONSULTATION WITH THE JUDICIARY.—Section 566(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(i) The Director of the United States Marshals Service shall consult with the Judicial Conference of the United States on a continuing basis regarding the security requirements for the judicial branch of the United States Government, to ensure that the views of the Judicial Conference regarding the security requirements for the judicial branch of the Federal Government are taken into account when determining staffing levels, setting priorities for programs regarding judicial security, and allocating judicial security resources. In this paragraph, the term 'judicial security' includes the security of buildings housing the judiciary, the personal security of judicial officers, the assessment of threats made to judicial officers, and the protection of all other judicial personnel. The United States Marshals Service retains final authority regarding security requirements for the judicial branch of the Federal Government."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 331 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"The Judicial Conference shall consult with the Director of United States Marshals

Service on a continuing basis regarding the security requirements for the judicial branch of the United States Government, to ensure that the views of the Judicial Conference regarding the security requirements for the judicial branch of the Federal Government are taken into account when determining staffing levels, setting priorities for programs regarding judicial security, and allocating judicial security resources. In this paragraph, the term 'judicial security' includes the security of buildings housing the judiciary, the personal security of judicial officers, the assessment of threats made to judicial officers, and the protection of all other judicial personnel. The United States Marshals Service retains final authority regarding security requirements for the judicial branch of the Federal Government."

SEC. 102. FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE REPORTS.

Section 105(b)(3) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App) is amended by striking subparagraph (E).

SEC. 103. PROTECTION OF UNITED STATES TAX COURT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 566(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking "and the Court of International Trade" and inserting "the Court of International Trade, and any other court, as provided by law".

(b) INTERNAL REVENUE CODE.—Section 7456(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to incidental powers of the Tax Court) is amended in the matter following paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end, and inserting "and may otherwise provide for the security of the Tax Court, including the personal protection of Tax Court judges, court officers, witnesses, and other threatened person in the interests of justice, where criminal intimidation impedes on the functioning of the judicial process or any other official proceeding."

SEC. 104. PROTECTION OF UNITED STATES TAX COURT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 566(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking "and the Court of International Trade" and inserting "the Court of International Trade, and the United States Tax Court, as provided by law".

(b) INTERNAL REVENUE CODE.—Section 7456(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to incidental powers of the Tax Court) is amended in the matter following paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end, and inserting "and may otherwise provide, when requested by the chief judge of the Tax Court, for the security of the Tax Court, including the personal protection of Tax Court judges, court officers, witnesses, and other threatened persons in the interests of justice, where criminal intimidation impedes on the functioning of the judicial process or any other official proceeding."

(c) REIMBURSEMENT.—The United States Tax Court shall reimburse the United States Marshals Service for protection provided under the amendments made by this section.

TITLE II—CRIMINAL LAW ENHANCEMENTS TO PROTECT JUDGES, FAMILY MEMBERS, AND WITNESSES

SEC. 201. PROTECTIONS AGAINST MALICIOUS RECORDING OF FICTITIOUS LIENS AGAINST FEDERAL JUDGES AND FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.

(a) OFFENSE.—Chapter 73 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 1521. Retaliating against a Federal judge or Federal law enforcement officer by false claim or slander of title

"Whoever files, attempts to file, or conspires to file, in any public record or in any private record which is generally available

to the public, any false lien or encumbrance against the real or personal property of an individual described in section 1114, on account of the performance of official duties by that individual, knowing or having reason to know that such lien or encumbrance is false or contains any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 73 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“1521. Retaliating against a Federal judge or Federal law enforcement officer by false claim or slander of title.”.

SEC. 202. PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUALS PERFORMING CERTAIN OFFICIAL DUTIES.

(a) OFFENSE.—Chapter 7 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 119. Protection of individuals performing certain official duties

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Whoever knowingly makes restricted personal information about a covered official, or a member of the immediate family of that covered official, publicly available—

“(1) with the intent to threaten, intimidate, or incite the commission of a crime of violence against that covered official, or a member of the immediate family of that covered official; or

“(2) with the intent and knowledge that the restricted personal information will be used to threaten, intimidate, or facilitate the commission of a crime of violence against that covered official, or a member of the immediate family of that covered official,

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘restricted personal information’ means, with respect to an individual, the Social Security number, the home address, home phone number, mobile phone number, personal email, or home fax number of, and identifiable to, that individual;

“(2) the term ‘covered official’ means—

“(A) an individual designated in section 1114;

“(B) a grand or petit juror, witness, or other officer in or of, any court of the United States, or an officer who may be serving at any examination or other proceeding before any United States magistrate judge or other committing magistrate;

“(C) a public safety officer (as that term is defined in section 1204 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968) who is employed by a public agency that receives Federal financial assistance; and

“(D) a paid informant or any witness in a Federal criminal investigation or prosecution or in a State criminal investigation or prosecution of an offense that is in or affects interstate or foreign commerce;

“(3) the term ‘crime of violence’ has the meaning given the term in section 16; and

“(4) the term ‘immediate family’ has the meaning given the term in section 115(c)(2).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“119. Protection of individuals performing certain official duties.”.

SEC. 203. PROHIBITION OF POSSESSION OF DANGEROUS WEAPONS IN FEDERAL COURT FACILITIES.

Section 930(e)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “or other dangerous weapon” after “firearm”.

SEC. 204. CLARIFICATION OF VENUE FOR RETALIATION AGAINST A WITNESS.

Section 1513 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) A prosecution under this section may be brought in the district in which the official proceeding (whether pending, about to be instituted, or completed) was intended to be affected, or in which the conduct constituting the alleged offense occurred.”.

SEC. 205. MODIFICATION OF TAMPERING WITH A WITNESS, VICTIM, OR AN INFORMANT OFFENSE.

(a) CHANGES IN PENALTIES.—Section 1512 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) so that subparagraph (A) of subsection (a)(3) reads as follows:

“(A) in the case of a killing, the punishment provided in sections 1111 and 1112;”;

(2) in subsection (a)(3)—

(A) in the matter following clause (ii) of subparagraph (B) by striking “20 years” and inserting “30 years”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “10 years” and inserting “20 years”;

(3) in subsection (b), by striking “ten years” and inserting “20 years”; and

(4) in subsection (d), by striking “one year” and inserting “3 years”.

SEC. 206. MODIFICATION OF RETALIATION OFFENSE.

Section 1513 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(B)—

(A) by inserting a comma after “probation”; and

(B) by striking the comma which immediately follows another comma;

(2) in subsection (a)(2)(B), by striking “20 years” and inserting “30 years”;;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting a comma after “probation”; and

(ii) by striking the comma which immediately follows another comma; and

(B) in the matter following paragraph (2), by striking “ten years” and inserting “20 years”; and

(4) by redesignating the second subsection (e) as subsection (f).

SEC. 207. GENERAL MODIFICATIONS OF FEDERAL MURDER CRIME AND RELATED CRIMES.

Section 1112(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “United States,” and inserting “United States—”;

(2) by striking “Whoever is guilty of voluntary manslaughter,” and inserting the following:

“(1) subject to paragraph (3), whoever is guilty of voluntary manslaughter”;

(3) by striking “Whoever is guilty of involuntary manslaughter,” and inserting the following:

“(2) subject to paragraph (3), whoever is guilty of involuntary manslaughter”;

(4) at the end of paragraph (2) (as designated by paragraph (3)), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) whoever is guilty of an offense under section 1114 or chapter 73 that involved a killing shall—

“(A) in the case of voluntary manslaughter, be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 20 years, or both; and

“(B) in the case of involuntary manslaughter, be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.”.

SEC. 208. ASSAULT PENALTIES.

Section 115 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in subsection (b) by striking “(1)” and all that follows through the end of paragraph (1) and inserting the following :

“(1) The punishment for an assault in violation of this section is a fine under this title and—

“(A) if the assault consists of a simple assault, a term of imprisonment for not more than one year, or both;

“(B) if the assault resulted in bodily injury (as defined in section 1365), a term of imprisonment for not more than 10 years;

“(C) if the assault resulted in serious bodily injury (as defined in section 1365), a term of imprisonment for not more than 15 years; or

“(D) if a dangerous weapon was used during and in relation to the offense, a term of imprisonment for not more than 30 years.”.

SEC. 209. DIRECTION TO THE SENTENCING COMMISSION.

The United States Sentencing Commission is directed to review the Sentencing Guidelines as they apply to threats punishable under section 115 of title 18, United States Code, that occur over the Internet, and determine whether and by how much that should aggravate the punishment pursuant to section 994 of title 28, United States Code. In conducting the study, the Commission shall take into consideration the number of such threats made; the intended number of recipients, whether the initial sender was acting in an individual capacity or part of a large group.

TITLE III—PROTECTING STATE AND LOCAL JUDGES AND RELATED GRANT PROGRAMS

SEC. 301. GRANTS TO STATES TO PROTECT WITNESSES AND VICTIMS OF CRIMES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 31702 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13862) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) by a State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe to create and expand witness and victim protection programs to prevent threats, intimidation, and retaliation against victims of, and witnesses to, violent crimes.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 31707 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13867) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 31707. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated \$20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2012 to carry out this subtitle.”.

SEC. 302. ELIGIBILITY OF STATE COURTS FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL GRANTS.

(a) CORRECTIONAL OPTIONS GRANTS.—Section 515 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3762a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) grants to State courts to improve security for State and local court systems.”;

and

(2) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following:

“Priority shall be given to State court applicants under subsection (a)(4) that have the greatest demonstrated need to provide security in order to administer justice.”.

(b) ALLOCATIONS.—Section 516(a) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3762b) is amended—

(1) by striking “80” and inserting “70”;;

(2) by striking “and 10” and inserting “10”; and

(3) by inserting before the period the following: “, and 10 percent for section 515(a)(4)”.

(C) **STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO CONSIDER COURTS.**—The Attorney General may require, as appropriate, that whenever a State or unit of local government or Indian tribe applies for a grant from the Department of Justice, the State, unit, or tribe demonstrate that, in developing the application and distributing funds, the State, unit, or tribe—

(1) considered the needs of the judicial branch of the State, unit, or tribe, as the case may be;

(2) consulted with the chief judicial officer of the highest court of the State, unit, or tribe, as the case may be; and

(3) consulted with the chief law enforcement officer of the law enforcement agency responsible for the security needs of the judicial branch of the State, unit, or tribe, as the case may be.

(d) **ARMOR VESTS.**—Section 2501 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 379611) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “and State and local court officers” after “tribal law enforcement officers”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting “State or local court,” after “government.”.

SEC. 303. GRANTS TO STATES FOR THREAT ASSESSMENT DATABASES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Attorney General, through the Office of Justice Programs, shall make grants under this section to the highest State courts in States participating in the program, for the purpose of enabling such courts to establish and maintain a threat assessment database described in subsection (b).

(b) **DATABASE.**—For purposes of subsection (a), a threat assessment database is a database through which a State can—

(1) analyze trends and patterns in domestic terrorism and crime;

(2) project the probabilities that specific acts of domestic terrorism or crime will occur; and

(3) develop measures and procedures that can effectively reduce the probabilities that those acts will occur.

(c) **CORE ELEMENTS.**—The Attorney General shall define a core set of data elements to be used by each database funded by this section so that the information in the database can be effectively shared with other States and with the Department of Justice.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2011.

TITLE IV—LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS **SEC. 401. REPORT ON SECURITY OF FEDERAL PROSECUTORS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on the security of assistant United States attorneys and other Federal attorneys arising from the prosecution of terrorists, violent criminal gangs, drug traffickers, gun traffickers, white supremacists, those who commit fraud and other white-collar offenses, and other criminal cases.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall describe each of the following:

(1) The number and nature of threats and assaults against attorneys handling prosecutions described in subsection (a) and the reporting requirements and methods.

(2) The security measures that are in place to protect the attorneys who are handling

prosecutions described in subsection (a), including threat assessments, response procedures, availability of security systems and other devices, firearms licensing (deputations), and other measures designed to protect the attorneys and their families.

(3) The firearms deputation policies of the Department of Justice, including the number of attorneys deputized and the time between receipt of threat and completion of the deputation and training process.

(4) For each requirement, measure, or policy described in paragraphs (1) through (3), when the requirement, measure, or policy was developed and who was responsible for developing and implementing the requirement, measure, or policy.

(5) The programs that are made available to the attorneys for personal security training, including training relating to limitations on public information disclosure, basic home security, firearms handling and safety, family safety, mail handling, counter-surveillance, and self-defense tactics.

(6) The measures that are taken to provide attorneys handling prosecutions described in subsection (a) with secure parking facilities, and how priorities for such facilities are established—

(A) among Federal employees within the facility;

(B) among Department of Justice employees within the facility; and

(C) among attorneys within the facility.

(7) The frequency attorneys handling prosecutions described in subsection (a) are called upon to work beyond standard work hours and the security measures provided to protect attorneys at such times during travel between office and available parking facilities.

(8) With respect to attorneys who are licensed under State laws to carry firearms, the policy of the Department of Justice as to—

(A) carrying the firearm between available parking and office buildings;

(B) securing the weapon at the office buildings; and

(C) equipment and training provided to facilitate safe storage at Department of Justice facilities.

(9) The offices in the Department of Justice that are responsible for ensuring the security of attorneys handling prosecutions described in subsection (a), the organization and staffing of the offices, and the manner in which the offices coordinate with offices in specific districts.

(10) The role, if any, that the United States Marshals Service or any other Department of Justice component plays in protecting, or providing security services or training for, attorneys handling prosecutions described in subsection (a).

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS **SEC. 501. EXPANDED PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR THE UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 995 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) The Commission may—

“(1) use available funds to enter into contracts for the acquisition of severable services for a period that begins in 1 fiscal year and ends in the next fiscal year, to the same extent as executive agencies may enter into such contracts under the authority of section 303L of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 2531);

“(2) enter into multi-year contracts for the acquisition of property or services to the same extent as executive agencies may enter into such contracts under the authority of section 304B of the Federal Property and Ad-

ministrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 254c); and

“(3) make advance, partial, progress, or other payments under contracts for property or services to the same extent as executive agencies may make such payments under the authority of section 305 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 255).”.

(b) **SUNSET.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall cease to have force and effect on September 30, 2010.

SEC. 502. MAGISTRATE AND TERRITORIAL JUDGES LIFE INSURANCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 604(a)(5) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after “hold office during good behavior,” the following: “magistrate judges appointed under section 631 of this title, and territorial district court judges appointed under section 24 of the Organic Act of Guam (48 U.S.C. 1424b), section 1(b) of the Act of November 8, 1877 (48 U.S.C. 1821), or section 24(a) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (48 U.S.C. 1614(a)).”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to any payment made on or after the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 503. ASSIGNMENT OF JUDGES.

Section 296 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end of the second undesignated paragraph the following new sentence: “However, a judge who has retired from regular active service under section 371(b) of this title, when designated and assigned to the court to which such judge was appointed, shall have all the powers of a judge of that court, including participation in appointment of court officers and magistrates, rulemaking, governance, and administrative matters.”.

SEC. 504. SENIOR JUDGE PARTICIPATION IN THE SELECTION OF MAGISTRATES.

Section 631(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking “Northern Mariana Islands” the first place it appears and inserting “Northern Mariana Islands (including any judge in regular active service and any judge who has retired from regular active service under section 371(b) of this title, when designated and assigned to the court to which such judge was appointed)”.

SEC. 505. GUARANTEEING COMPLIANCE WITH PRISONER PAYMENT COMMITMENTS.

Section 3624(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: “Upon the release of a prisoner by the Bureau of Prisons to supervised release, the Bureau of Prisons shall notify such prisoner, verbally and in writing, of the requirement that the prisoner adhere to an installment schedule, not to exceed two years except in special circumstances, to pay for any fine imposed for the offense committed by such prisoner, and of the consequences of failure to pay such fines under sections 3611 through 3614 of this title.”.

SEC. 506. STUDY AND REPORT.

The Attorney General shall study whether the generally open public access to State and local records imperils the safety of the Federal judiciary. Not later than 18 months after the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall report to Congress the results of that study together with any recommendations the Attorney General deems necessary.

SEC. 507. REAUTHORIZATION OF FUGITIVE APPREHENSION TASK FORCES.

Section 6(b) of the Presidential Threat Protection Act of 2000 (28 U.S.C. 566 note; Public Law 106-544) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” after “fiscal year 2002,”; and

(2) by inserting “, and \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2012” before the period.

SEC. 508. INCREASED PROTECTION OF FEDERAL JUDGES.

(a) MINIMUM DOCUMENT REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.—For purposes of section 202(b)(6) of the REAL ID Act of 2005 (49 U.S.C. 30301 note), a State may, in the case of an individual described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (2), include in a driver's license or other identification card issued to that individual by the State, the address specified in that subparagraph in lieu of the individual's address of principle residence.

(2) INDIVIDUALS AND INFORMATION.—The individuals and addresses referred to in paragraph (1) are the following:

(A) In the case of a Justice of the United States, the address of the United States Supreme Court.

(B) In the case of a judge of a Federal court, the address of the courthouse.

(b) VERIFICATION OF INFORMATION.—For purposes of section 202(c)(1)(D) of the REAL ID Act of 2005 (49 U.S.C. 30301 note), in the case of an individual described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(2), a State need only require documentation of the address appearing on the individual's driver's license or other identification card issued by that State to the individual.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, our Nation's judiciary has been the repeated targets of death threats and sometimes even violent acts. In 2005, for example, the family members of a Federal judge in Chicago were murdered. Two weeks later, a State judge, court reporter, and a sheriff's deputy were killed in an Atlanta courthouse. And so it is these acts of violence in the judiciary that bring us together.

Along with others, we have begun on the Judiciary Committee to realize the need for legislation that will perhaps try to deal more effectively with these concerns of safety in the courts. So I am pleased that the gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, BOBBY SCOTT; and Judge LOUIE GOHMERT of Texas, a distinguished member of the committee, have joined with me in this effort.

What we seek to do is improve the security for court officers and the safeguards of judges and their families. We achieve this objective by making several revisions in the current law.

First, we make the current redaction authority of Federal judges under the Ethics and Government Act permanent. What this provision will do is prevent would-be aggrieved litigants and others who might use a Federal judge's personal information to determine how they might threaten him or her or a family member of the court.

Another thing we do in this legislation is authorize an additional \$120 million for the United States Marshals Service over the course of the next 6 years. These monies will enable the service to increase ongoing investigations and expand protective services that are currently provided to the Federal judiciary. This is a long overdue item, and we were glad that we reached authorizing agreement on it.

The bill also makes it a Federal offense to publish the personal information of a judge, law enforcement officer, or witness with the intent to cause some act of intimidation or harassment, or to commit a crime of violence. This measure authorizes \$100 million over the course of the next 5 fiscal years to create and expand the witness protection programs to assist witnesses and victims of crime.

It has taken a couple years to put these various pieces together in the bill, and we think that time for its passage is immediate, if not overdue, and I urge my colleagues to give favorable consideration to this very common-sense proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 660, the Court Security Improvement Act of 2007. This legislation is a bipartisan effort, as the chairman just mentioned, to improve the security of those who administer our justice system, as well as those who serve as witnesses, victims, and their families.

In recent years, Mr. Speaker, we have seen an increase in violence and threats against judges, prosecutors, defense counsel, law enforcement officers, courthouse employees; and the list is virtually endless. It is critical that we address this violence in order to preserve the integrity of, and the public confidence in, our justice system.

The murders of family members of U.S. District Judge Joan Lefkow and the brutal slayings of Judge Rowland Barton and his court personnel in Atlanta are just a few of the many examples that underscore the need to better protect those who serve our judiciary and their respective families.

According to the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, almost 700 threats a year are made against Federal judges. In numerous cases, it has been necessary to assign Federal judges security details for fear of attack by terrorists, violent gangs, drug organizations, and disgruntled litigants.

The problem of witness intimidation and threats has also continued to grow,

particularly at the State and local levels, where few resources are available to protect witnesses, victims, and their families.

H.R. 660 improves coordination between the United States Marshals Service and the Federal judiciary and bolsters security measures for Federal prosecutors handling the dangerous trials against terrorists, drug organizations, and other organized crime figures.

This bill also prohibits public disclosure on the Internet and other public sources of personal information about judges, law enforcement officers, victims, and witnesses, and protects Federal judges and prosecutors from organized efforts to harass and intimidate them through false filings of liens or other encumbrances against personal property.

Additionally, H.R. 660 provides grants to State and local courts to improve their security services. I want to thank the majority for working with us to include other important provisions that were not in the original legislation.

Under our bipartisan agreement, the legislation we consider today, Mr. Speaker, also contains increased criminal penalties for assaults against Federal law enforcement officers, makes permanent the redaction authority for judges filing ethics disclosure forms, and reauthorizes the Presidential Threat Task Forces.

Although we were unable to include in this legislation a provision that ensures retired and off-duty police officers permission to carry firearms under a Federal law enacted in 2004, I appreciate Chairman CONYERS' and Subcommittee Chairman SCOTT's promise to move and pass on suspension the Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act of 2007, which accomplishes that goal.

It is imperative, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we continue to work together on a bipartisan effort to ensure that judges, witnesses, courthouse personnel, and law enforcement officers do not have to face threats and violence when discharging their duties.

At the State and local level there is a dire need to provide basic security services in the courtroom and for witnesses. H.R. 660 represents a significant first step in this area.

Mr. Speaker, when I served as chairman of the Crimes Subcommittee in the previous Congress, the House passed legislation to improve court security, only to see it die in the other body. I commend Chairman CONYERS, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan; Ranking Member SMITH, distinguished gentleman from Texas; as well as Crime Subcommittee Chairman SCOTT, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia; and another distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Representative FORBES, for their continued leadership on this issue, and hope that we can successfully get this legislation across the finish line.

Finally, I want to acknowledge what Chairman CONYERS did, what Ranking

Subcommittee Chairman BOBBY SCOTT did, and the effects, as you mentioned, Mr. Chairman, of Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT, the distinguished gentleman from Texas who himself is a former judge. These three gentlemen were tireless advocates for better judicial security, and I urge my colleagues to support this critical bipartisan measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for these closing remarks.

I agree with HOWARD COBLE, the gentleman from North Carolina, that our Nation's court system and those who work there must function in a safe and professional environment, and that is what we are improving in this measure. We have worked together in great harmony and cooperation, and the measure helps in a substantial way to promote better security for our judiciary and other court personnel, and I urge our colleagues to support the passage of this critical measure.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 660, the "Court Security Improvement Act of 2007." This legislation will go a long way toward enhancing the security and integrity of our judicial system and the able men and women who comprise the Federal judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote the Chief Justice of the Texas Supreme Court: "Our democracy and the rule of law depend upon safe and secure courthouses." That is because an independent judiciary is essential for a regime based on the rule of law. Nothing can do more to undermine the independence of the judiciary than the very real threat of physical harm to members of the judiciary or their families to intimidate or retaliate. In 1979, U.S. District Court Judge John Wood, Jr., was fatally shot outside of his home by assassin Charles Harrelson. The murder contract had been placed by Texas drug lord Jamiel Chagra, who was awaiting trial before the judge.

In 1988, U.S. District Court Judge Richard Daronco was murdered at his house by Charles Koster, the father of the unsuccessful plaintiff in a discrimination case. The following year, U.S. Circuit Court Judge Richard Vance was killed by a letter bomb sent to his home. The letter bomb was attributed to racist animus against Judge Vance for writing an opinion reversing a lower-court ruling to lift an 18-year desegregation order from the Duval County, Florida schools.

In this age of the global war on terror, the danger faced by Federal judges, judicial officers, and court personnel is real, as illustrated by the three murders noted above. The recent and tragic murder of U.S. District Court Judge Joan Humphrey Letkow's husband and mother reminds us that the danger has not abated.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 660 provides a three-pronged legislative response to the security challenges facing our judicial institutions and personnel. First, it directs the U.S. Marshals Service to consult with the Judicial Conference regarding the security requirements for the judicial branch, in order to improve the implementation of security measures needed to protect judges, court employees, law enforcement officers, jurors and other members of the public who are regularly in Federal courthouses.

The bill also extends authority to redact information relating to family members from a Federal judge's disclosure statements required by the Ethics in Government Act and removes the sunset provision from the redaction authority, thus making the redaction authority permanent.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 660 also enhances the security and protection of judicial personnel and their families by making it a criminal offense to maliciously record a fictitious lien against a Federal judge or Federal law enforcement officer. This new crime and punishment is intended to deter individuals from attempting to intimidate and harass Federal judges and employees by filing false liens against their real and personal property.

The bill also makes it a crime to publish on the Internet restricted personal information concerning judges, law enforcement, public safety officers, jurors, witnesses, or other officers in any U.S. Court. The penalty for a violation is a maximum term of imprisonment of 5 years. Additionally, the bill increases the maximum penalty for killing or attempting to kill a witness, victim, or informant to obstruct justice or in retaliation for their testifying or providing information to law enforcement by increasing maximum penalties.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, this bill makes a substantial contribution to the enhancement of security of judicial institutions and personnel. I urge all members to join me in supporting this beneficial legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I too yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 660, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERSTATE RECOGNITION OF NOTARIZATIONS ACT OF 2007

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1979) to require any Federal or State court to recognize any notarization made by a notary public licensed by a State other than the State where the court is located when such notarization, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1979

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Interstate Recognition of Notarizations Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. RECOGNITION OF NOTARIZATIONS IN FEDERAL COURTS.

Each Federal court shall recognize any lawful notarization made by a notary public licensed or commissioned under the laws of a State other than the State where the Federal court is located if—

(1) such notarization occurs in or affects interstate commerce; and

(2)(A) a seal of office, as symbol of the notary public's authority, is used in the notarization; or

(B) in the case of an electronic record, the seal information is securely attached to, or logically associated with, the electronic record so as to render the record tamper-resistant.

SEC. 3. RECOGNITION OF NOTARIZATIONS IN STATE COURTS.

Each court that operates under the jurisdiction of a State shall recognize any lawful notarization made by a notary public licensed or commissioned under the laws of a State other than the State where the court is located if—

(1) such notarization occurs in or affects interstate commerce; and

(2)(A) a seal of office, as symbol of the notary public's authority, is used in the notarization; or

(B) in the case of an electronic record, the seal information is securely attached to, or logically associated with, the electronic record so as to render the record tamper-resistant.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ELECTRONIC RECORD.—The term "electronic record" has the meaning given that term in section 106 of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act (15 U.S.C. 7006).

(2) LOGICALLY ASSOCIATED WITH.—Seal information is "logically associated with" an electronic record if the seal information is securely bound to the electronic record in such a manner as to make it impracticable to falsify or alter, without detection, either the record or the seal information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

□ 1615

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, this measure is a commonsense requirement with respect to the process of notarizing documents that occur in every State, every city, every county. And what we do in H.R. 1979 is simply to require Federal and State courts to recognize documents lawfully notarized in any State of the Union when interstate commerce is, in fact, involved.

As we all know, notary publics play a critical role in ensuring that the signer of a document is, indeed, who he or she claims to be and that the person has willingly and without coercion signed the document. By performing these two tasks, the notary public serves as an indispensable first line of defense against fraudulent acts and other manipulations of contracts and other documents.